

40  
*Daniel B. Smith*  
*Harvard*  
A LETTER

ADDRESSED BY

JAMES CANNINGS FULLER,

OF SKANEATELES, STATE OF NEW YORK,

TO THE

EDITOR OF THE LONDON "FRIEND,"

RELATIVE TO AN ARTICLE IN THE FOURTH NUMBER OF THAT  
PUBLICATION, ON THE RECENT SECESSION FROM THE YEARLY  
MEETING OF INDIANA :

ALSO,

A LETTER FROM THREE FRIENDS OF INDIANA  
TO JAMES C. FULLER, ON THE SAME SUBJECT :

AND

THE DECLARATION

ISSUED BY THE YEARLY MEETING OF ANTI-SLAVERY FRIENDS  
OF INDIANA, IN JUSTIFICATION OF THEIR SECESSION.

---

DUBLIN :

PRINTED BY WEBB AND CHAPMAN,  
100, GREAT BRUNSWICK-STREET:

---

1843.

04 JUNE 1991

*Special Collections*

E  
445  
.I3  
F8  
1843

# PREFACE.

---

## TO THE READER.

It is in no wise agreeable, that during a visit to my native land, any portion of the time devoted to that purpose should be employed in controversial writing; or in making an exposure of the general condition of "Friends" in the land of my adoption, with respect to their adherence in *practice* to those principles,—Christian in their origin and philanthropic in their effect,—denominated Anti-Slavery. Yet a desire accompanies my mind, that where duty points the way for the furtherance of the cause of human rights, I may be found therein at whatever sacrifice. This little work, in its present form, might not have appeared, had Charles Tyler, one of the Editors of "The London Friend," admitted to its columns my remarks on the leading article in the fourth number of that periodical. I would that the London editors (or censors of the press) who, it is reported, are of the first standing in society, were similar to those of "The British Friend," who, like the Bereans, "search whether those things are so," and freely admitted some strictures of mine on the article in question, to which strictures thou art referred for further information.

The first article of the following series is the letter rejected by one of the London editors, with the information (and it was the only reason assigned) that he "must decline inserting the letter in *The Friend*." It remains to be seen what ground he or the reputed editor will occupy; but I apprehend if they do not define their position, or if they continue to shut out the light of free discussion, the days of that publication are numbered.

The second article speaks for itself; yet it may be right to state that the parties whose names are signed to it, are three 'worthy friends;' the two first were members of the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting, and were expelled therefrom without any reason being assigned. The third is an ancient friend, with whom I am personally acquainted. I believe the first forty years of his life were spent in Slave states, and he ascribes his escape from the soul-blighting influence of the pro-slavery spirit, to his having removed to reside within the limits of Indiana Yearly Meeting. To this friend is committed an excellent gift in the ministry, the exercise of which has caused him to travel extensively; and at all times, when so engaged, to the comfort and satisfaction of his friends, and particularly so to those of other denominations who have attended his "public meetings. From the moral worth of these friends, all credence may justly be afforded to their statements.

The third and last article is the Declaration of Indiana Anti-Slavery Yearly Meeting, for which I ask a careful and prayerful perusal, remarking that I have used the freedom to italicise some portions of it. Its publication, as well as that of the private letter of my three friends, is undertaken solely on my own responsibility.

In conclusion, permit me to call thy serious attention to the following quotations. The first is from the Epistle of Anti-slavery Friends of Indiana, addressed to the London Yearly Meeting:—

"We earnestly desire that our dear brethren of your Yearly Meeting may not be misled by the specious but absurd objection, that circumstances in the two countries render it *right* for Friends in England to join in the Anti-slavery

enterprise, while it is *wrong* for us in America to do the same thing. You may rest assured that the objections and arguments used here against the practice, are just as strong on one side of the water as the other; and our opposers, by condemning us, condemn you; and indeed some do not hesitate to censure your Anti-slavery conduct in direct terms. When we reflect that your meeting has contributed largely to the funds of an Anti-slavery Society composed of Friends and others, thus giving such associations the most unequivocal evidence of its approbation; and that in this country the Yearly Meeting has taken the most energetic measures to put down all its members who unite in such associations, and even those who have not so united, but are not prepared to unite with those proscriptive measures; and to exclude the cause and its advocates from our meeting-houses, thus depriving them in many places of the opportunity of pleading the cause of the poor and needy, the conviction is forced upon us, that there is a radical error in the conduct of your Yearly Meeting, or of the old Yearly Meeting of Indiana.

"The contrast is exhibited in a glaring manner in the facts connected with the proposed World's Convention, to be held in London in sixth month next. The call for delegates was signed, as you know, by an esteemed member of your Meeting, as chairman of the Executive Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society; and for responding to that call, for taking part in appointing a delegate in compliance with that call, Friends here who thus acted, and the Friend who received the appointment, are obnoxious to severe censure. Now can the Friends who were instrumental in making that call, when they meet in the capacity of the Yearly Meeting of London, take any steps which shall, even by implication, cast censure on that delegate, and, when they meet in the World's Convention, receive him with cordiality, as they will be bound to do? *We cannot, we will not believe, that our dear Friends will act thus inconsistently, and by discountenancing us, give the severest blow to the Anti-slavery cause in this country which it has ever received.*"

The next is from the Epistle of the same Yearly Meeting to its own members :—

"As many of you have not been with us at this time, to witness for yourselves the unanimity, the harmony, and brotherly condescension by which our deliberations have been conducted, and above all, the holy solemnity which has covered our assembly, we would say for your encouragement, that the overshadowing canopy of divine regard has evidently been felt to cover us, and in reverent humility and self-abasedness we wish to ascribe all the praise to Him who has thus favoured us with his holy presence, to the confirming of our souls in the belief that our thus assembling together has been owned by him.

"It is only by a faithful discharge of known duty that we can be entitled to hear the joyful language addressed to us, 'well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' Our separation from the Yearly Meeting with which we have heretofore been connected, has not been made without due reflection and much anxious inquiry, with breathings of soul for proper direction in our tried situation, and strength to perform our duty, let our sufferings in consequence thereof be what they may."

# A LETTER.

&c.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FRIEND."

With sorrow of heart have I read and reread the leading article in No. 4 of "The Friend," and in behalf of 2,486,900 of our fellow heirs of immortality, bought with the precious blood of our Holy Redeemer, yet held as chattel property in the boasted "land of the brave and home of the free;" and also on behalf of those members of the Society of Friends in America, who endeavour to sustain the testimonies held by Friends in England, and as promulgated by its Yearly Meeting from time to time, do I claim a right in the columns of "The Friend," to be heard in reply to an article which "bites like an adder and stings like a serpent." It commences with the announcement of the "peculiarly trying situation of Friends in the different Yearly Meetings in America, in reference to the subject of slavery," and remarks that "unless it be removed, the end will be a separation between the Free and the Slave States." As an American citizen, and one who has had no small intercourse since residing in the country, from some little knowledge of slavery and its direful effects on the enslaver as well as the enslaved, and having attended half of the Yearly Meetings on the Continent, I declare that with my power of vision I cannot see the "peculiarly trying situation" of Friends, as to what is their duty in reference thereto. Is it not their duty to keep their hands clean from the accursed system, and to "cry aloud and spare not"? Was not the voice of Friends in England, both in their collective, and, by desire of the Yearly Meeting, in their individual capacity, heard on this subject? and should not Friends in America do the like under like circumstances? I have yet to learn that what is right on one side of the Atlantic ocean for Friends to be found in the performance of, is wrong on the other side of the mighty deep: away with such time serving expediency! rather let English Friends spur on their transatlantic brethren to the performance of their duty, until the song of jubilee shall be heard throughout the United States, and let the echo and its reverberations be heard to the praise of our Maker throughout all his dominions.

In primitive days, in the State of Massachusetts, Daniel and Provided Southwick, son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick, were fined by the courts of Salem and Ipswich for non-attendance on the public ordinances; as they had no estates, and would not work out their fines, they were ordered to be *sold as slaves* either in Barbadoes or Virginia. Since that time, members of our Society have been held as slaves in Algiers. Friends in

these cases were in a "peculiarly trying situation." Were they then dumb? No; in the latter case, society was aroused, for Friends in England, Ireland, Scotland, and America saw eye to eye, and raised means in each country to redeem their brethren in religious profession, and so it would be again, were only two or three "Friends" held in bondage by some cruel task-masters, and doubtless, all the powers of the different courts of the world that could be prevailed on to act, would be importuned to aid and assist in their liberation, and justly so; but I want to know are the gushing sympathies of our common nature to flow only for our fellow members of religious society? Did not the Almighty create all men? Did not the Redeemer buy us all with his precious blood? Are not all men brethren? Then if we feel and act aright for the few, how ought American friends to feel and act for and towards nearly three millions of their fellow heirs, created for happiness on earth, and never ending bliss in the world to come? Are they to be restrained,—can they be restrained from doing that which "is lawful and right," because the Hicksites or Separatists are charged with acting "injudiciously and violently?" Are Friends to be frightened from their posts of duty, and it may be of sore conflict, by the alarm of "endangering our peaceable principles, by uniting with political abolitionists?" Are not Friends in America as well as elsewhere, interested in politics; and do they not carry out their biases in that respect? If Friends in Indiana are not, what could induce the Clerk of Indiana Yearly Meeting to take Henry Clay to the First-day-morning meeting, while he was travelling on an electioneering campaign, and his being placed in the ministers' gallery? What, I ask, could induce a Yearly Meeting to admit, *or to suffer* such an outrage on Quaker decency, as was that of allowing a slaveholder, to say nothing of his duelling or gambling propensities, to sit in their gallery, except for *political capital*? "After the close of the meeting, men and women, ministers and elders, gathered round him in the ministers' gallery, giving the strongest evidence, by their introductions and salutations, of the high estimation in which they held him; he, in return, taking care to return the compliment with all the etiquette for which he is famed." Where is the spirit and testimony of our forefathers in the truth? I would that the spirit of Benezet and Woolman could be heard to answer the interrogatory; such a sight, methinks, is enough to make angels weep and devils laugh, and sober Christians say of us as a society, "Ichabod! Ichabod! The glory is departed!"

I think I see the cause of the cry of "wolf, wolf," when no such destroying beast is near the fold, and if I mistake not, it

is put forth as a feeler against the coming Yearly Meeting, to prejudice the minds of Friends in this land against those Friends in the State of Indiana, who are acting consistently with their Christian profession; and I am distressed to know it has had the effect of inducing some Friends hastily to conclude, that *we* (meaning English Friends) cannot acknowledge them by receiving their epistle. I wish to ask such to take a "sober second thought," and weigh both sides of this deeply interesting question, as in the balance of the sanctuary, and I fear not the result on the general question, nor on the "prudence and sound discretion exercised by Yearly Meetings, which have refused to have their meeting houses open for abolition lectures, lest the mob might materially injure if not destroy the meeting houses."

The authority of "The Friend" among its British readers may not be questioned, and an horror may be created at the idea of orthodox Friends associating with Hicksites, who, it is said, are guilty of "injudicious and violent proceedings." Supposing this to be all true, (but to the best of my knowledge it has no foundation in truth,) I ask if it be not a loud and imperative call on our Society that *our* standing should be apparent, that all men should know *our* position, the more especially when we are complimented by Henry Clay and other Slave-holders, Ex-President Martin Van Buren and other apologists of Slavery. In some sense it may be correct that the Hicksites are injudicious as relates to their endeavours to promote the abolition of Slavery, I apprehend they set up no claim to infallibility: show them a more excellent way, and I answer for it they will pursue it, but do not attempt by sectarianism to narrow the Anti-Slavery platform. American abolitionists, those who are "sound to the core," want it broad enough and wide enough that all "wearing the human face divine" may stand and act upon it, leaving each one to settle with his conscience and his Maker all theological questions. I am induced to ask how dare any one on this side of the Atlantic, to charge the Hicksites or Separatists with being an Anti-Slavery body; for surely the imputation is implied in the article under review. Without any hesitancy do I aver it is a libel on them; and if the doctrine of Ellenborough, the late Chief Justice of England, be correct, that "the greater the truth, the greater the libel"—then the charge is a monstrosity, and the editors ought to retract a charge, which, should it be generally known in America, would cause grief to the body of persons thus libelled. The Hicksite Yearly Meetings of Baltimore, Indiana, Ohio, and New York, and perhaps their other Yearly Meetings, furnish too abundant evidence that they have departed from the faith and works of love of early Friends, so far as regards the question of inviolability of

man's self ownership, and the rights and duties of our coloured brethren. The Hicksite Monthly Meeting of New York disowned three of its members for their adherence to sound Anti-Slavery principles: one of them, Charles Marriott, with whom for personal worth few can compare and none excel; the other, Isaac T. Hopper, a champion in their cause, and who was first and foremost at the time of the separation, and the most active in conducting and directing subsequent law suits. To the satisfaction of his coadjutors did he display his abilities and devotedness to serve Hicksism, and as some acknowledgment, I have heard they presented him with one thousand dollars,—money hard earned I should say, in every sense of the word. Just let us see what that body swallows as gospel ministry. The chief satellite in Rose-street meeting, in New York city, oftentimes indulges in such as this when speaking of abolitionists and Anti-Slavery lecturers,—“servants of the devil,” “emissaries of Satan,” “hypocrites,” “blasphemers,” “coming out of the bottomless pit,” &c. “If any of you are connected with these Anti-Slavery and *Temperance* lectures and associations that are moving about like troubled waters, leaving their filth and slime behind them on the earth,—leave them. God is not with them. And bye and bye, all these preachers and lecturers will become more disgusting than the poor miserable drunkard lying in the kennel! And I can believe that if it were possible to rake up, and bring forth all the corrupt dead that be buried beneath ancient Babylon, and all the rotten and corrupt carcasses that perished at Sodom and Gomorrah, they would be received with open arms as associates, and hailed as worthy coadjutors and co-workers in their righteousness, as they term it.”

Are these the people who “advocate the abolition cause with great zeal, and are injudicious and violent in their Anti-Slavery proceedings”?

As to the fear expressed of Friends uniting with “political abolitionists,” do let the readers of “The Friend” and those with whom I am associated in America, have a homily on the subject, and should not all your powers be exhausted on it, do favor us with your views, as well as those of the society, (if it ever expressed any) on the danger and impropriety of “Friends” mixing or associating with others in the way of trade or commerce. Or is all the fear appended to associating with benevolent individuals, in promoting endeavours that have a tendency to ameliorate human suffering, and consequently to promote human happiness?

If English Friends have forgotten what their forefathers did, do just tell them that the first *political* effort that was made in England on the Slave trade and Slavery, (to the honor of the



principles held by Friends,) was made by the Yearly Meeting, when it petitioned the British legislature (I think) in 1783 or 1785. And did it not in 1831, or thereabout, call on its members to *unite with their philanthropic neighbours*, to endeavour to obtain from Parliament an amelioration of the criminal code, and the abolition of West India Slavery. It cannot be possible that Friends in this land repudiate such doings; if they do, is there not great cause to fear their candlestick is removed out of its place?

Does not the article under review militate against one of the most noble testimonies the Christian can be called to bear—fidelity to truth and principle, leaving consequences in the hands of Him without whose knowledge a sparrow does not fall to the ground? From whence does the "prudence" come, that closes Friends' meeting-houses against abolition lectures? From whence, when it *closes them against our own members, who, under a sense of religious duty*, ask for the loan of them, to introduce to the notice and regard of the community, the woes and sufferings of insulted humanity borne by the outraged Slave? Is it from heaven or beneath? Are our meeting-houses more precious than truth? Is any meeting-house more precious than my body? For it seems the *mob might* injure the house; and the article in question calls it "sound discretion," to see that by no means our meeting-houses should be injured. Why did it not express some sympathy for those who can and do trust in a preserving Power, knowing that they have to face and endure the doings of a pro-slavery mob, and jeopardize, as I have done, not only property but life also. And I rejoice to know there are *many others* alike circumstanced, who have withstood and will withstand Slavery and its minions. To whom can we look among men for kindness and sympathy, when our British "Friends" shall repudiate their old principles and practices—the former being an emanation from Heaven's high Court, whose Judge has so eminently blessed the latter?

In conclusion, with respect to the idea of a general Convention of American Friends in Philadelphia, or New York, to form an Association of the Members of our Religious Society exclusively, and that the Parent Society should be located in the former, from whence all publications relating to Slavery should be distributed to its auxiliaries in other Yearly Meetings, *except those in the Slave States*, for the purpose of creating a channel or *safety valve*,—surely the writer of this must be a Philadelphian, and his steam up to its highest pressure. A safety valve for Friends! what an idea! perfectly original—as much so as the construction of the *Ærial* machine; and I prophesy, Friends' zeal in America will never endanger their bursting. They stand in no

need of a "safety valve," but need adding more fuel, and yet more and more, until they shall arise and shine in the splendour and brightness our Heavenly Father, I believe, designed they should. Anti-slavery Friends in America dare not put this cause of God and humanity to nurse, or to be cradled in any city in the Union, much less that of Philadelphia; it is too far south—too near Mason's and Dixon's line to have the cause cared for and cherished: for assured I am, that Moses in his bulrush cradle was more secure from harm, either of the waters of the Nile or the crocodiles therein, than would be the Anti-Slavery cause, if left to the controul or management of Friends in Philadelphia; for it would, with their nursing, soon die of depletion, starvation, or neglect. Yet, doubtless, there a few sound hearts in that city among Friends. I would say, rather let it be cradled in our back-woods, and among an unsophisticated and an uncorrupted people—if such we have; if not, let each Friend fearlessly and faithfully perform the duty assigned him by our Creator.

I am informed Friends in Philadelphia could join in the "*Tippecanoe and Tyler too*" processions of 1840; but when the new Constitution of Pennsylvania was offered for acceptance to the inhabitants of that State, with the word *white* introduced into it, whereby the coloured people were to be disfranchised, Friends, as a body, had they chosen so to do, might have prevented such an act of gross injustice being perpetrated, and thus preserved to the coloured citizen his right to vote at elections; yet Friends, as I was told, supinely staid away from the ballot box, and thus tacitly permitted about 40,000 coloured citizens to be robbed of the elective franchise. It may be well to remark, that in the city of Philadelphia alone the coloured people have fifteen churches, which, with their halls, are worth 172,000 dollars; they have thirty-four ministers, seventeen first-day schools, a public library of five hundred volumes, besides about nine thousand in private libraries, and have tract, bible, and temperance societies; and they contribute to the city funds for the poor more than they receive back in alms.

I have tried to be brief, and to compress as much as possible; and have not given my views in half the breadth I should like to have done, and which the subject demands; but supposing your columns are crowded with other communications, I subscribe myself your friend,

JAMES CANNINGS FULLER,

Skaneateles, State of New York.

Bristol, Fourth Month 19th, 1843.

P.S.—I desire to state the following fact, in answer to the work of supererogation that it would be, to inform Friends of

Great Britain that those in America feel a deep sympathy with the oppressed Negroes held in bondage. In Indiana Yearly Meeting I learn "it is a notorious fact, that the leaders of the Society generally, and all those who unite with the proceedings of the Body, as scrupulously avoid an Anti-slavery meeting as they would the theatre or the ball-room;" and that "very many in the foremost ranks are, decidedly opposed to assisting fugitive slaves, and the Committee on the concerns of the people of colour, in one Quarterly Meeting, came to the judgment that they would not assist in educating the children of a coloured family, *because their parents were fugitives from Slavery.*" Is not this almost beyond belief? Will London Yearly Meeting correspond with a Yearly Meeting in whose borders such things are done? It remains to be seen whether it will do so, or whether it will give or withhold the right hand of fellowship from those who have set up another Yearly Meeting, growing out of the circumstance that they have pursued the line of conduct *recommended by it*; and in accordance with all the dictates of Christianity and humanity.

JAMES CANNINGS FULLER.

## LETTER FROM THREE FRIENDS OF INDIANA.

Newport, Indiana, Wayne County,  
Third Month 13th, 1843.

JAMES C. FULLER,

ESTEEMED FRIEND,—We have been favored with the perusal of a letter recently written by thee to Levi Coffin; from which we learn thy intention of being in England by the 23d of this month, and remaining till after the great Anti-Slavery Convention.

Agreeably to thy request, we forward to thee the printed minutes of our Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, and request thee to use them so as to bring the contents as much possible before Friends, previous to the ensuing Yearly Meeting. We also desire thee to use thy influence and knowledge of facts, for the purpose of correcting any unfavorable impressions that have been, or may be made on the minds of English Friends, with regard to our proceedings in this country. All we desire is, that they may not be imposed upon by the misrepresentation of our opposers, and that they may have a clear understanding of the deleterious influence of the action of the Society on the Anti-Slavery cause. We have been encouraged from time to time in our Anti-Slavery labors, by the advice and example of our

transatlantic Friends; and in consequence of pursuing a course in accordance with that advice and example, and which we firmly believe was required at our hands, we have been reduced to the necessity of taking a step of a very important nature, and which, perhaps, may seem unjustifiable to those who are not fully acquainted with the circumstances. We wish it to be distinctly understood that we were under the strongest obligation, either to comply with the direction of the ruling part of society, by withdrawing our co-operation from the Anti-Slavery cause, and thus bring the entire weight of Friends in this country to bear upon that cause with all its crushing influence, or to withdraw from the connection, and establish a society of Anti-Slavery Friends. While the action of the Yearly Meeting went no further than advice, we did not consider ourselves absolutely bound to do either; but when this advice came to be enforced as a positive rule, and all who were active in the cause, or who could not unite in the proscriptive measures, were treated as offenders, and their names cast out as evil, not only in the Yearly Meeting, but down to the subordinate branches, we felt bound to submit, or secede. Indeed we were already cut off from all the benefits of society. We were spoken of in public as out of the bosom of society, and some of the leaders of the opposition frequently urged us to a separation. As we could not, for conscience sake, desert the cause of the slave, we chose to organize a Society of Friends upon its true principles, and in practice following the advice and imitating the example of English Friends.

We wish Friends there to know that the arguments used here to condemn our Anti-Slavery action, are equally applicable to them, and that our opposers by condemning us do virtually condemn them. That the circumstances so much talked of, which are supposed to render it improper for Friends *here* to join Anti-Slavery Societies, while it is quite proper *there*, are all imaginary, except indeed it is unpopular *here* while it is popular *there*. If our English brethren should by any means be induced to give sanction to the arbitrary proceedings of Indiana Yearly Meeting, and to refuse us the right-hand of fellowship, it will undoubtedly do more to impede the progress of the present Anti-Slavery enterprize, than any other act which can be accomplished by any other society in Christendom. Thou knowest in which scale the influence of Friends generally in this country lies; and if the weight of London Yearly Meeting be added to it, what will be the consequence? We are aware that great pains will be taken to convince

Friends in England, that Friends here are really Anti-Slavery, and that they have done nothing to hinder but much to advance the cause. It is true they have from time to time issued something on the subject that was good in itself, and calculated to interest the feelings of the people in the cause. But it is said, example speaks louder than precept. As soon as the *people* (who alone under Providence can abolish slavery) began to move, and the multifarious interests of slavery inspired its advocates and satellites with indignation, astonishing as it may seem, Friends, as a body, joined in the condemnation of that very work which had been produced, perhaps, mainly by their own labors. It will be for ever vain and fruitless for Friends to speak against slavery, and to put on, in an occasional address to the public, the appearance of a zeal that would seem to move heaven and earth in behalf of the suffering slave, and then turn round and condemn the efforts of all "who do not profess to wait for Divine direction in these important matters." Or in other words, "because they follow not with us." It is utterly futile for Friends to profess great love for Anti-Slavery principles, and then shut their houses against the advocates of those principles, and shun them as they would the advocates of infidelity. It is a notorious fact, that the leaders of the Society generally, and all those who unite with the proceedings of the body, as scrupulously avoid an Anti-Slavery meeting as they would the theatre or the ball-room. Their comparative estimate of an Anti-Slavery advocate and a slaveholder, may be seen in the attention paid to the excellent Charles C. Burleigh and to Henry Clay. In short, it is a well known fact, that the influence of the Society of Friends in this country is almost universally understood to be opposed to the Anti-Slavery enterprise. Even the advocates of perpetual slavery eulogize them. And we have no doubt but the love of popularity, or "place and influence," is the leading cause of the action of the Society against abolition.

In order to retain "place and influence" with the slaveholder, we must please him,—and in order to please him, we must refrain from identifying ourselves with the abolitionists, whom he hates. It is precisely the same argument that was used by Winans in the Methodist General Conference in 1836, in favor of the holding of slaves by Methodist ministers, in order to "retain place and influence" with slaveholders, and to get an opportunity to preach to them. He said it was necessary for the preacher to hold slaves, that he might be free

from all suspicion of the taint of abolition. In addition to all this, we are persuaded that there is a great deal of radical unsoundness on this subject among the heads of society. Colonization is a darling scheme with some in the foremost ranks; while others do not seem prepared to admit the slaves to immediate and unconditional emancipation. An individual, appointed by the Yearly Meeting to fill the place of one of those declared disqualified, has, since his appointment, declared that he did not believe the slaves were prepared for freedom,—if they get a little liberty, they want all,—slavery ought to be abolished, but it should be gradual. Very many in the foremost ranks are decidedly opposed to assisting fugitive slaves; and the committee on the concerns of the people of color, in one quarterly meeting, came to the judgment that they would not assist in educating the children of a colored family, because their parents were fugitives from slavery.

If the Anti-Slavery cause were personified, well might it say, “save me from my friends, and I will take care of my enemies;” or, in the language of the poet:—

“An open foe may prove a curse,  
But a pretended friend is worse.”

The selfish and exclusive principle which has so lamentably overspread the Society in this country, forbidding Friends to co-operate with others in works of general charity and benevolence, and the amelioration of the condition of suffering humanity, is, in our estimation, strong evidence of a departure from the pure principles of Quakerism; for it has always been the case, that as corruption has crept in, the church became more exclusive, and assumed a more exalted tone of self-righteousness, and was more and more inclined to confine all good within its own pale.

The withdrawal of this co-operation must undoubtedly have a deleterious influence on the question of reformation, in regard to the great doctrine of the peaceable nature of Christ's kingdom, and the removal of other heathenish practices that have overspread Christendom.

With due respect, we are sincerely thy friends,

BENJAMIN STANTON,  
H. H. WAY,  
DANIEL PUCKETT.

---

## DECLARATION.

We feel ourselves called upon by the circumstances in which we are placed, in justice to ourselves, to the Society of Friends throughout the world, to the cause of truth and righteousness in the earth, and by a just regard to the feelings of the community at large, to make a public declaration of the causes by which we have been driven into our present position. It is reasonable to expect that the public should be desirous of information on this subject; and we believe it right that we should make them acquainted with the circumstances which have reduced us to the necessity of separating from those with whom we have formerly been in connection, and to organize ourselves into a Society of Friends, upon the true principles of that society, in which we may enjoy those religious privileges and benefits which we highly prize, and of which we have been arbitrarily and unhappily deprived by the proscriptive measures of the ruling part of the Yearly Meeting.

Before we proceed to the statement of the causes of separation, it will be proper to declare that we have not separated from the principles of the Society, nor from its testimonies and discipline, but from that body of members who have departed from our testimony against slavery, and from a due respect to the discipline. *We wish it distinctly understood, that we have adopted no new doctrine, nor any new system of church government; that we claim to be, in the strictest sense of the word, a Society of Friends, with no other nominal distinction in the title which we have adopted, than that which is necessary to distinguish us from those from whom we have separated, and to express our adherence to our well known testimony against slavery.*

Although it is a humiliating consideration, yet by a reference to the history of the past, we find that there is a universal liability in all associations, both civil and religious, to deterioration and corruption. Even the first Christian church organization, the purest the world ever witnessed, departing little by little from the truth as it is in Jesus, finally arrived at such a state of depravity, as to advocate or connive at all kinds of wickedness—at the very works of the devil himself, which the great author of the religion it professed came into the world to destroy.

By yielding to the convictions of truth upon their understandings, the primitive Friends were not only enabled to discover many of the corruptions which had gradually found their way

into Christendom, but were also induced to bear a faithful testimony against them. They separated themselves from those religious communities with which they were formerly connected, and in order that they might have an opportunity to strengthen and encourage one another in the support of their religious principles and testimonies, they formed themselves into a distinct religious society.

And although they seem to have taken the greatest precaution, in order to prevent a recurrence of similar corruptions and abuses in the church, as appears by their various lucid declarations of sentiment, their powerful reasoning in support of their principles and doctrines, and their forcible and scriptural definition of the power and authority of the church; as well as the duty and obligation resting upon its individual members relative thereto, showing that without the aid and assistance of the power and spirit of God leading thereto, no decision or decree of the church is available, and that "it is the duty of each individual member to assent to the judgment of truth, whether pronounced by few or many, independent of any *worldly* or selfish consideration;—yet facts and circumstances connected with the society in this country at the present time, sorrowfully demonstrate the inefficiency of all this, good as it is in itself, without a frequent and effectual recurrence to first principles, without that deep and heartfelt concern to ascertain the truth, and to perform that which duty requires at our hands, which is the only conservative exercise calculated to prevent the influx of that natural depravity, as we before observed, to which all such institutions are liable.

As the Society of Friends was first gathered, and that most emphatically under the influence of this concern and exercise, so by the descending of the same mantle upon their successors, it was enabled to see the entire sinfulness of various practices, which in its infancy escaped attention; such as buying, selling, and holding slaves, the use of intoxicating drinks, &c. and so long as it as a body continued in this situation, there was a gradual approximation to perfection in its testimonies. Through the unremitted labours of Woolman, Benezet, and kindred spirits, Friends of the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia cleared themselves from holding slaves, from whence the concern spread to the other yearly meetings on the continent, with the same happy result. *About this time, James Pemberton, Warner Mifflin, and many other friends eminent for their piety and virtue, apprehending that much advantage to the cause of the oppressed Africans might be derived from duly enlisting all classes of the community in their behalf, engaged in the formation of associations for that purpose, within the limits of several of the Yearly*



*Meetings, and the most gratifying consequences were the result. Under the influence of these societies, feelings of friendship and commiseration for this oppressed and deeply injured people increased and spread through the country, until public sentiment became so changed as to abolish slavery by law in seven of the original states of this confederacy. But after much good had been effected through the agency of these institutions, a combination of adverse circumstances conspired to change the current of feeling. The hand of cruel avarice became afresh nerved to its unholy grasp by the prospect of extensive gain, through the facilities offered by the invention of the cotton gin. This prospect and desire of gain was not confined to those immediately engaged in holding slaves, but extended with lamentable effect to many of those in the free states inclined to enter into mercantile or manufacturing operations. This class included a number of the most wealthy and influential in the Society of Friends, in the Middle and Eastern States; and the natural and consequent intercourse between them and the Slaveholders of the South, had a direct tendency to leaven them into the same lordly, pompous, and intolerant feeling.\* This cir-*

---

\* We believe it has been owing, to a considerable extent, to the influence and agency of this class in the Eastern States, that the opponents of the Anti-Slavery cause at present amongst us have succeeded in so completely changing the character of the proceedings of our Yearly Meeting. It has also been through their representation, or misrepresentation, that some of our transatlantic brethren have been induced to join them in opposition to us. They have persuaded them that a difference of circumstances exists between England and America, and such as to render it altogether improper to engage in an enterprise in the latter, which it would be right to approve and promote in the former. This difference, however, although repeatedly asked for, and recently attempted to be given, has never been exhibited to us. On the contrary, their objections to Friends joining with others, are such as all must see, upon moderate reflection, are equally applicable to the Society on both sides of the Atlantic.—*Note to Declaration.*

As an amusing illustration of the light in which Anti-Slavery exertions are viewed in some parts of the United States by Friends, I will relate the following anecdote. In Eleventh month, 1842, while on an Anti-Slavery visit to the State of Massachusetts, I happened to be in the town of Lynn, about seven miles from Boston, where there is a large meeting of Friends. On Seventh day evening, I convened a number of Friends for the purpose of holding an Anti-Slavery meeting,—the special object of which was to ascertain the nature of our duties and responsibilities to the cause. The Friends' meeting house being positively refused, I was obliged with about 150 individuals to convene in the meeting house of a sect called "Christians," which Anti-Slavery Friends hired for that purpose. At this meeting, an individual (not a member of the Society) who happened to be present, stood up at the close, and said, "If this be what you call a *moral suasion* meeting, nothing but good can grow out of such meetings, and Heaven will bless such efforts." On the following day, (First day) 6th of Eleventh month, in the afternoon meeting at Friends' meeting-house, Amy Breed, a female Friend, stood up and made the following remarks, which turned the eyes of the con-

cumstance taken in connection with that of the formation and active operation of the Colonization Society, instituted mainly by slave-holders, and purposely for the removal of the "free people of colour" from the country, and in order that none of the despised class might enjoy liberty among us, almost sealed the fate of genuine Anti-Slavery feeling in the Society. The associations instituted for the purpose of creating this feeling were suffered to go down, and the energies and resources of the people were prostituted to that of sending out of the country those who already enjoyed personal freedom, instead of being applied to the alleviation of the distresses of the bondman. In short, the cold hand of apathy and the still more withering influence of an inveterate prejudice spread almost a universal gloom around the cause of African freedom. There were still, however, those in different parts of the country who bore a decided testimony against the spirit of the times. In 1832, a resuscitation of the Anti-Slavery cause commenced in one of the Eastern States.

But the appearance of animation being but small at first, but little apprehension of its becoming an efficient organization was entertained by many of its enemies until some time afterwards. And although no Anti-Slavery Society existed within the limits of this Yearly Meeting until several years subsequent to the above date, yet there were a number of those among us who bore testimony against the spirit to which we have referred. This number holding an influence to some extent in the society, the Yearly Meeting in 1836 issued the following advice relative to the subject under consideration:—

"We feel ourselves called upon at the present time, affectionately and tenderly to caution all our dear friends to take no part in, nor render any aid to any political association on the subject of African slavery, which is or may be founded on principles either directly or indirectly having a tendency to promote the unrighteous work of expatriation, it being our settled conviction that this work, as a condition to the slaves being liberated, is unjust and oppressive." Advices similar to this were issued at different successive periods, and much care taken to speak in an encouraging manner in regard to those engaged in the present Anti-Slavery enterprise;—"and Friends affection-

---

gregation upon me:—"My sheep know my voice and they follow me, but a "stranger they will not follow. My mind has been impressed ever since I "took my seat this evening, that there are wolves in sheep's clothing, who "devour widow's houses and for a pretence make long prayers, that they may "be seen of men. My feelings have been impressed since I have been "sitting amongst us, that there are wolves, or a wolf, amongst us, of whom "it is necessary to be aware."—J. C. F.

ately advised to be so alive to our testimony against slavery, as neither through prejudice or otherwise to cast any discouragement in the way of those who are faithfully labouring to promote universal emancipation, whether such labourers be found within or without the pale of society," but to "endeavour to spread the concern, and enlighten the minds of the people, by giving circulation to such publications as are calculated to advance the cause of immediate emancipation on Christian principles."

"And a concern has been felt to arise that Friends generally may be stirred up to renewed diligence in faithfully maintaining our testimony against slavery; not shrinking therefrom on account of opposition, or the fear of persecution; but that we may individually be willing, in true simplicity, to inquire whether there is not something for us to do for this suffering portion of our fellow-creatures. We do not wish any to engage in active measures on any other ground than a sense of duty, and in accordance with our well-known principles; yet we would encourage all to a close examination as to what is required at their hands, and how they may employ the talents committed to them for noble purposes, in the advancement of the blessed work of universal emancipation, by meekly yet boldly, either publicly or privately, pleading the cause of the oppressed." At the same time, however, some recommendations to consider whether the time had not come in which it would be most safe for members of our religious society to abstain from mixing with others in benevolent associations, &c. were contained in the minutes of the meeting; and were no doubt the sentiments of some who were the real friends of immediate emancipation, and weightily considered by others of this class, who, like Pemberton and his worthy coadjutors in the cause, had joined with others in the formation of Anti-slavery Societies. But as they had become convinced of the necessity of "endeavouring to spread the concern, and enlighten the minds of the people," and as they could not discover any plan which would so effectually facilitate the accomplishment of this desirable object, they could not, for conscience sake, abandon those societies which they had been instrumental in gathering, the good effects of which had now become obvious, and thus cause the interest which had been excited in behalf of their suffering brethren and sisters in bonds, to languish or totally disappear: and seeing the work in which they were engaged was so highly spoken of by the meeting, and that the advice on this head was given on account of a fear that some of our principles might be compromised, and not in consequence of the actual existence of anything of the kind; they therefore continued actively engaged as before, confidently

believing that preservation would be experienced in the performance of so necessary a work, although it might render them at times somewhat more exposed.

Here it is worthy of remark, that ever since the issuing of the advices repudiating the Colonization scheme, there were some of our prominent members open advocates of that institution, who appeared to have been fired with indignation at the expression of such sentiments, evidently entertaining a settled purpose to prostrate the Anti-slavery cause and its advocates in the Society, if ever a favourable opportunity should present. And now, as this cause progressed, the main body of its enemies, who had heretofore entertained but little apprehension of its success, and who had remained apparently in almost a state of indifference in regard to the subject, through the alarm taken and communicated by those of kindred spirits in the Eastern States, and by discovering the project so gratifying to their prejudices (the Colonization scheme) to sink in public estimation, in consequence of the Anti-slavery movement, together, through the instrumentality of the individuals above referred to, suddenly became aroused to action, and inspired with a determination to arrest its onward course. Hence no time was lost at this favourable moment in taking occasion, from the circumstances in which we were placed by the advices referred to, to cry out, "insubordination," "want of proper subordination to the authority of the church," &c. Advice in regard to joining with others from year to year grew more and more positive, gradually however becoming divested of the mask under which it was at first covered, and approximating as time advanced, and as the Anti-slavery cause prospered, to the full development of that Pro-slavery spirit which has so sorrowfully found its way into the bosom of society, and which the following exhibition of facts and circumstances will serve more fully to illustrate.

It should be recollected that the advice of which we have been speaking was originally intended by the friends of the Anti-slavery cause to refer to all benevolent societies without distinction. In 1840, in the renewal of the advice, it was applied to two only—"Abolition and Colonization Societies"—the latter of which, as before brought to view, had been specially condemned as being unjust and oppressive in its nature and tendencies, and hence it was artfully chained to the former, in order, if possible, to sink the character of the Abolition Societies to at least an equal depth, without an open manifestation of special hostility thereto.

In 1841, the opposition becoming more emboldened, it was again repeated, and confined to Anti-slavery Societies altogether; and even the use of our meeting houses was refused to

such societies for their accommodation in the transaction of their business.

At our last Yearly Meeting, in addition to this, not only those who had joined in these associations, but also such as had not, but yet could not, for conscience sake, denounce others therefor, were, by special act of the meeting, deprived of any privilege in regard to the transaction of any of its important business; and subordinate meetings were advised to pursue the same course of conduct down to the most remote and inferior branches; and that ostensibly on account of their being opposed to the advice and travail of the body, while, at the same time, some who were the most forward in endeavouring to enforce submission to *this* advice, were of those who were actively engaged in mixed associations of a different character, and in supporting, both directly and indirectly, the Colonization scheme, which, as we have already shown, the Yearly Meeting not only advised against, but declared to be unjust and oppressive. In addition to this, it is notorious that many of the same class have for several years past stood in open opposition to the advices of the meeting on other important subjects.

It may be proper here to state, that in order to avoid going contrary to the advice of the meeting by mixing with others, and at the same time be engaged in spreading the concern, &c. agreeably to the requisition of the body, several associations were formed in different parts, composed of Friends only, for that purpose. But, to our astonishment, as soon as we had taken this course, leading members of society, active opponents to mixed associations, declared this to be more objectionable than the other. It was said that in Society, in meetings for discipline were the places to labour in this cause.

This we readily admit to be correct, so far as relates to a reformation in society only. But recently, when this has been attended to, and the state of Society represented to the Yearly Meeting, although bound by discipline and all previous usage, as well as the very nature and design of the regulation, to notice the deficiencies reported, labouring for their removal, and to form the summary answers to the queries of the materials received from the Quarters, and notwithstanding several of these reported considerable deficiency in regard to our testimony against slavery, yet the meeting, independently, and without any regard thereto, most extraordinarily said that "Friends bear a testimony against slavery, *as far as appears.*"

According to our discipline relative to this subject, which had its origin under the influence of that feeling which instituted the first Anti-slavery organization, not only were members prohibited from holding or hiring slaves, and advised to avoid becoming

executors or administrators to estates where slaves are bequeathed, but also recommended not to be accessory to any step whereby their bondage might be prolonged; thus evidently opening a door for, and inviting the exercise of, a tender conscience in regard to any course of conduct whatever, which we might become convinced would have this effect. The African Committee, it is known, were appointed to have the care of the concerns of the people of colour amongst us, on account of the disabilities under which they labour, and their liability to be kidnapped and carried into slavery.

Being aware, upon reflection, that the consumption of the proceeds of slavery was the very thing which had reduced this people to a situation demanding the appointment of such a committee, many Friends, members of this committee, deemed it important, in order to carry out its object, as well as the spirit and design of the discipline above cited, that Friends should endeavour to avoid the use of such articles. Accordingly, one branch of the committee forwarded a report to its general meeting, treating the subject at some length, showing the impropriety and inconsistency of Friends sustaining a market for such productions. But when it was read in that body, it was spurned, it was rejected with manifest bitterness and contempt, and the subject prohibited being introduced again into the committee, upon the allegation that it was foreign to its object. Supposing that the subject demanded a serious examination, at least in some department of Society, one of the quarterly meetings in its report forwarded a proposition or request to our last meeting, to take into consideration whether the use of such products was not a support to Slavery and the Slave Trade, and whether they were not essentially prize goods; but when it came before that body, it refused to take any action whatever upon the subject.

Near the commencement of our last Yearly Meeting, a rule was adopted, that no person who stood in opposition to the advice and travail of the body should be appointed on any important business in the meeting; but it was evidently intended to be applied exclusively to those favorable to the Anti-Slavery enterprise; for the next day, when an important committee was to be appointed, a Friend was named who had recently contributed in a pecuniary point of view to the support of the Colonization Society, which being known to some of our friends, the circumstance was referred to, in a manner showing the inconsistency of confirming such a nomination, with the rule adopted, seeing his conduct was not only altogether contrary to the advice of a former meeting, but also, unlike that of Anti-Slavery Friends, of such a character as to encourage that which had been declared

thereby to be "unjust and oppressive." But the nomination was promptly sustained by those who still retain their place and influence; they wished the Friend to serve the meeting as proposed. It was then publicly observed, that if, with the information received, the meeting should persevere in the course it seemed to be taking, it must be taken for granted that its former advice against aiding the Colonization scheme was now rescinded; to all of which the meeting deigned not to reply, but immediately progressed onward with its business.

Henry Clay, the great champion of the proslavery Whig party, and intended candidate for the ensuing Presidency of the United States—the President of the American Colonization Society—the *slave holder and duelist*, whilst on an electioneering tour to the state of Indiana, attended a public meeting at Richmond, in the time of Yearly Meeting, word being given out that it was his intention to attend the public meeting of Friends on first day. His meeting was held on the day immediately preceding this, at which time a petition was presented to him, with near two thousand signatures appended, requesting him to give liberty to those of his fellow beings whom he had long deprived of their just and inalienable rights. In the course of his reply to this request, he said, "I own about fifty slaves. I consider them as my property. We have an idea that whatever the law secures as property is property." He owned that slavery was an evil, "but," said he, "the slaves must be prepared for freedom before they can receive that great boon; they must have moral cultivation. *The Society of Friends take the right stand in relation to this subject,*" &c. After this, a few Friends, in behalf of those who desired to "retain their place and influence," took an opportunity to inform him that "*the Society had no hand in getting up this petition—they had no unity with its presentation—it was the work of a few abolitionists,*" or words to this effect. The clerk of the Meeting, on first-day morning, took him in his carriage to meeting, Friends taking care to seat him in one of the most conspicuous places in the house. After the close of the meeting, men and women, ministers and elders, gathered round him in the ministers' gallery, giving the strongest evidence by their introductions and salutations of the high estimation in which they held him; he in return taking care to return the compliment with all the etiquette for which he is famed.

In order properly to estimate the whole of this transaction, it should be remembered that Henry Clay was only a private man. True he was an office seeker, but not an office holder. We were under no obligation to him as a ruler. Impartial justice, therefore, would have required just such treatment toward him, when

coming into our assemblies, as we would mete out to the "poor man in vile raiment" with the same grade of moral character; otherwise "we are partial in ourselves and become judges of evil thoughts, and are convinced of the law as transgressors." Now see the contrast.

At the time of Yearly Meeting in 1841, Charles C. Burleigh, an eminent philanthropist from the East, came to Richmond on a mission to plead the cause of equal and impartial justice—to plead the cause of millions of our innocent suffering brethren and sisters in bonds, who are not permitted to plead for themselves. But this man was treated with indignity—with utter contempt. He wished to hold meetings in and about Richmond—Friends closed their meeting-house doors against him, the doors of the public houses in town were closed also, and he was mobbed in the open street whilst addressing the people. He is a man of irreproachable character.

Thus it is evident, so far as an extensive tissue of facts and circumstances can establish, and so far as the fruit of a tree can manifest its character, that the influence by which the Yearly Meeting is now governed is pro-slavery, and that unsoundness lies at the bottom of the opposition with which we have been assailed. Various, however, are the grounds of this opposition with different individuals, and much too complicated to be fully described in our limits. But that which we doubt not is occupied by the greater number, is plainly alluded to in the following extract from the Epistle of Advice of 1841:—"Thus maintaining our peaceable and christian principles in unbroken harmony, we shall, we believe, be enabled, as way opens, more availing to plead the cause of this much injured race of our fellow-men, *and retain the place and influence which, as a Society, we have heretofore had with the rulers of the land.*"

The rulers of our land, being such as have been chosen by a pro-slavery community, are consequently opposed to the Anti-Slavery cause. They hate it—they despise it. Hence it is rightly judged impossible to retain a place and influence with such men, and hold any connexion therewith: it is indeed too unpopular.

This leads us to notice some of the circumstances said to exist in England, and not in America, which renders it right to join with others in the promotion of the Anti-Slavery cause in that country, whilst in this an opposite course is necessary. In order to carry out the proscriptive and disfranchising measures to which we have referred, a large committee was appointed in the Yearly Meeting, and one in the select body, to attend subordinate meetings. These have made considerable progress in the work. In one of the Quarterly Meetings, in their labours to



prove a difference of circumstances between the two countries, it was observed that in "England it was the wealthy and influential part of the community, with which Friends associated; the reverse of what was in practice in this country." And again, "that it was those in the foremost ranks of society amongst Friends who engaged in the work there," and consequently that it was the opposite class who had undertaken it here. In all this, do we not clearly see that the cross has become a stumbling block? Wealth and influence, or in other words, power, makes right. The full developement of this principle, truly is that upon which the whole system of American Slavery stands. What has become of the self-denying example and the uncompromising zeal of a Fox, a Barclay, a Penn, or of the whole band of pioneers in the reformation they commenced, with these their highly professing successors, in a reform of no less importance to the welfare of the human family?

Is it thus by yielding to the prejudice, or accommodating ourselves to the corrupt views and sentiments of those around us, or by conniving at their unhallowed deeds, that we should seek to promote the cause of truth and righteousness in the earth? In an interview which some of us had with this committee, one who stands about at the head of the opposition observed, that "the Anti-Slavery Societies were almost universally hated, especially in the South; and that if Friends should connect themselves therewith, ministers of our society could have no influence with the Slave-holders, nor even travel safely among them. In the exercise of his gift, if he should feel it his duty to go to the South on a gospel mission, he wished to be so situated as to have some influence, and be in no danger of molestation whilst there."

This objection is a very common one, and it seems to be deemed proof positive that it is well grounded, when they can refer to the friendly reception of a visit from those who are opposed to these societies, evidently being unmindful of or disregarding the Scripture declaration: "woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you, for so did their fathers to the false prophets."

In accordance with the sweeping system of virtual disownment to which we have referred, eight members of the Meeting for Sufferings were reported to the Yearly Meeting as unfit for the station, under the vague charge of disqualification. And the committee continued to make further report, if other obnoxious members should be found. It should constantly be borne in mind, that the professed cause of the adoption of these proscriptive measures, was that of some Friends going contrary to the advice and travail of the body; and surely a disregard of the general code of discipline should not be considered of less

importance. That discipline authorizes the Meeting for Sufferings to suggest the removal of members of that body, only in consequence of their declining or greatly neglecting the attendance of said Meeting; and as the members alluded to were among the most regular attendants thereof, we cannot but regard these proceedings as altogether arbitrary; for admitting the Yearly Meeting to have the power to make or change discipline at pleasure, (as was observed) yet nothing of the kind has ever been done, without making such a special object of consideration. And besides this, it should be remembered that the Meeting for Sufferings is a subordinate meeting, but yet it reported those members as disqualified, contrary to the plain letter of the discipline, and was sustained therein by the Yearly Meeting.

When this subject came before the meeting, one of those thus presented, made request in their behalf in an humble and feeling manner, that the minute should state the cause of their disqualification,—it was their due,—justice demanded it. *But this request, although reasonable as it was, was refused to be granted by the ruling party.* Thus they were publicly charged with that which merited ejection from that body, and yet deprived of knowing in what it consisted, as to any official information. But to return to our narrative respecting the Yearly Meeting's committee, and that from the select body: the work assigned them is now under rapid progress. *Ministers and elders who do not abandon the anti-slavery societies, or turn their hand against such as do not, or in other words, unite with the "advice and travail of the Body," are, by special direction, to be removed from their stations.* Agreeably to the course adopted and most strenuously adhered to by the yearly meeting, these committees have endeavored to prohibit any examination of the subject, except on their own side. They have invariably manifested a disposition in meetings, not to hear the reasons we would advance in our behalf. *In short, like the poor victims for which we plead, we are not permitted to plead for ourselves.*

When we take into consideration the awful state of public affairs in these United States, produced through the predominance of the slave holding principle, and when by the visible signs of the times, we are warned that the period cannot be very distant when slavery will be abolished, either by peaceful legislation or in the midst of violence and blood, ("for the needy shall not always be forgotten: the expectation of the poor shall not perish forever,") and when we turn in our minds to all the noble and mighty achievements wrought through the agency of Anti-Slavery Societies, from the first efforts of Clarkson and his coadjutors to the final completion of British West India emancipation, including the efforts of similar societies in this country,

by which the foul institution was abolished in seven of the original states, and when we reflect upon the vast amount of anti-slavery feeling at the present time in the United States, created through these instrumentalities, and that the State Anti-Slavery Society of Indiana, and its auxiliaries, would be much weakened without our assistance, the question arises, can we then abandon the cause, and be clear of our brother's blood?—We cannot.

*This question being decided, the next is, is it better for us to suffer ourselves to be separately disowned, and scattered abroad, to be deprived of the comforts, consolations and preserving influence of church fellowship, or to avail ourselves of our indisputable right to form a religious society in which we can enjoy these privileges?* The answer to this inquiry, we apprehend must be obvious to every sober and reflecting person, who has any confidence in the usefulness of religious society. Consequently, we have deemed it our duty to adopt the latter alternative. Many of us have for a considerable time labored with much anxious solicitude for the restoration or conversion of many of our brethren in society, to soundness of judgment and purity of principle in regard to this subject; and as long as any door of hope was left unclosed, that this object could be effected, we have been made willing to suffer all the contumely they have seen meet to pour upon us: but by the proceedings already referred to, we have from all appearances been completely shut out from any access to the feelings and consciences of a large number of our fellow members, who have thereby been taught to look upon us as transgressors, lying under the just and merited censure of the society, and of course unworthy of their confidence and fellowship. And now taking into consideration the natural and legitimate consequences to the bleeding bondman's cause, which must result from this unceasing and increasing opposition to its advocates, and that by thus remaining in a formal connexion (even if we could, under present circumstances), we should give countenance to its unrighteous and anti-christian course; and also reflecting upon the situation in which the society here is involved, through the prevalence of that spirit which rejects that most necessary and salutary advice of our discipline, "to manage the affairs of society in the spirit of meekness and wisdom, with decency, forbearance, and love to each other;" which issues advices, and renders them equivalent to positive injunctions, without listening to, or in many instances even suffering the exhibition of the evidence of truth against the propriety of their adoption, by a fair and candid examination thereof; which closes the ear against the claims of bleeding humanity, by refusing to look into the subject of consuming the produce of the

Slave's toil, and the necessary tendency which such a practice has to perpetuate his sufferings; which will not allow liberty of conscience in the performance of so obvious a duty, as that of uniting with our fellow citizens in endeavoring to interest the community in behalf of the bondman, and which tramples the discipline and order of society under foot, in order to carry out its purposes!—therefore we feel bound (in justice to this most righteous cause, and in order to clear ourselves from any participation in the evils and guilt which would be the unavoidable consequence of the influence which our remaining in connection therewith would wield against the cause of humanity), publicly to separate ourselves from that body, to obey the Scripture injunction, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

We wish not to be understood, as denying that there is any Anti-Slavery feeling among the members of the Yearly Meeting from which we have now seceded. On the contrary, we doubt not but that many of them are desirous to promote immediate and unconditional emancipation, and are only restrained from active labours in the cause, by the proscriptive measures of the "body" so called; measures which have been brought about chiefly by the agency of those individuals, who, we believe, are too anxious to "retain a place and influence with the rulers of the land." Our opposers have argued for, and some who have appeared to be strong abolitionists, seem to have adopted the doctrine, that it is the duty of members to yield obedience to the authority of the Yearly Meeting, even when its requisitions are contrary to their own convictions of what is right. Such we conceive to be in a very precarious situation, and in danger of quenching the Spirit, in order to obey the body. And we would recommend to their serious consideration an excellent saying of Wm. Penn:—

"I abhor two principles in religion, and pity them that own them. The first is, obedience upon authority, without conviction; and the other, destroying them that differ from us, for God's sake. Such a religion is without judgment, though not without teeth; union is best, if right; else, charity."

With entire consciousness of our innocence, and the justice of our cause, we, in humble confidence in the protection of the God of the oppressed, submit that cause to him who judgeth righteously.